

IDEALISM AND SIROHI – THE EVENT



By Slavoj Žižek

The true idealism today is to argue out that historical materialism is finally a form of dialectical materialism, that in fact we can read Trotsky side by side with historical materialism and develop its theses as praxis or practico-mediation of historical materialism, as in fact what Mao calls dialectical materialism.

1 Dialectical Synthesis – History, the basic historical materialism as a matrix, with Meditations of Auxillaries and even the synthesis as progressive deepening of empirical mutiplicity, which then amounts to progressive movements which are syntheses in fact and not structures, which amounts to the reversed process of real investitgation, trusted as short-hand – Idealism as Matthew who then is waiting for Christ in a neave.

Everything we established in the linguistics of the structural type then follows from our fundamental agreement with historical materialism. The conjectural type of jottings are finally to be integrated to the totalisation of method. I have proposed certain methodological rules; but they cannot be valid, in fact they cannot even be discussed, unless the materialist dialectic can be assumed to be true. Where I argue that the materialist kernel and rational kernel of the Hegelian dialectic is finally the material Being, its expressions all amounting to as well a methodological complexity of facts and determinations, even finally organic styles of the black people, all meant to organise the material conjuncture into classes, mass politics and even finally institutions of the state It must be proved that a negation of a negation can be an affirmation, that conflicts — within a person or a group — are the motive force of History, that each moment of a series is comprehensible on the basis of the initial moment, though irreducible to it, that History continually effects totalisations of totalisations, and regressive-progressive method can be

grasped as finally the problem of the individual, which then is placed into the context of totalisation as a simple black dialectic which is then humanism, by which I mean finally to precept the individual as man making history, but not in circumstances of his choosing and conditions of his choosing, which then becomes a dialectical statement of praxis, which means material sectors of say the developing totalisation in the working class sector of Detroit then forms a union with the intellectual class and this then is facticity being negated for a freedom praxis and history which transcends the conditions to a popular front.

But these principles cannot be taken for granted; indeed most anthropologists (anthropologues) would reject them. Of course, the determinism of the positivists is necessarily a form of materialism: whatever its subject matter. But it normally rejects the reinteriorisation of the different moments in a synthetic progression. Where we see the developmental unity of a single process, the positivists will attempt to show several independent, exterior factors of which the event under consideration is the resultant. What the positivists reject is a nominalism of interpretation. As any particular one, but in general that the scientist must adopt, in every case and at every level, a totalising attitude towards his subject matter.

Within the limits of an empirical anthropology this distrust of the a priori is perfectly justified. I have shown in the the Militant Inquiry of Methodology that this is necessary if a living Marxism and liberalism is to incorporate into itself the disciplines which have hitherto remained external to it. However, whatever else one may say about it, this incorporation must consist in revealing beneath the classical determinism of particular 'fields', their dialectical connection with the whole or, where we are dealing with processes whose dialectical character is already recognised, in revealing this regional dialectic as the expression of a deeper totalising movement. The bracketing of the parts and contours appearing in black plantation history for example is the nature of the material within an archaeology which Sirohi recommends being the only "as such" of its own material envelopment by Being. Being is therefore not as Ambedkar or Giri argue a multiplicity of determinations but their abstract Being, their pure historico-critical investigation.

So we must take up the whole problem once again, and explore. The source of this dogmatism lies in the basic problem of 'dialectical materialism'. In setting the dialectic back on its feet Marx revealed the true contradictions of realism. These contradictions were to be the very substance of knowledge, but they have been concealed. We must therefore take them as our starting-point. And this then is the true addage, substance is subject or that substantial cogito is finally split by subjecthood.

The superiority of Hegelian dogmatism, for those who believe in it, lies precisely in that part of it which we now reject — its idealism. For Hegel, the dialectic had no need to prove itself.. Thus the totalisation was complete: all that remained was to bring down the curtain. Besides, and most important, the movement of Being and the process of Knowledge are inseparable. This implies, as Hyppolite rightly says, that Knowledge of the Other (object, world, nature) is self-Knowledge, and conversely. Thus Hegel could write: 'Scientific

knowledge be suffered in the realm of Being in order to be recognised in the development of Knowledge; and it would have to be lived in the movement of knowledge in order to be attributed to the development of the object. In Hegel's time, this seemed to imply the identity of Knowledge and its object. Consciousness was consciousness of the Other, and the Other was the being-other of consciousness.

Imagine Matthew who is waiting at a railway station and approaches a man for a cigarette at the store, now he proceeds to totalising his claim that Annie will be there and come there in a few half an hour minutes, and all the processes here have become abstract, like the future, and the present joined and a past that goes past the man, which is now turning around and looking at Annie who walks past him without noticing – a missed encounter, but a totalisation grasped on the telephone as conjectural.

This then is the true idealism of Sirohi, that the identical is subject and self-knowledge as "I know" right.

2. Marxism

Marx's originality lies in the fact that, in opposition to Hegel, he demonstrated that History is in development, that Being is irreducible to Knowledge, and, also, that he preserved the dialectical movement both in Being and in Knowledge. He was correct, practically. But having failed to re-think the dialectic, understood that vast historical syntheses, but also the most modest assertions of dialectical Reason: whatever we may say or know, however close we may be to the present or past event which we attempt to reconstitute in its totalising movement. Certain totalising truths – but not the whole Truth. That in fact dialectical in-itself is what Sirohi calls the obviousness of medicines, or health and eternity and truths spent cheaply like a Wittgensteinian truism – the philosopher is the establishment of the in fact of the matter, he is dogmatically in fact a militant. I call this Marxism and Malcolm X in Sirohi's jargon, the infinitude of the subjective process as the Truth-procedure in identical to searching for him. The knowledge as Being, is subject and substance becoming identical to knowledge by a parallax shift in the being by self-subjective knowledge – that I am educated, or a black power man. I call this envelope and sheaf in the subject. I mean just be sheafed.

Regressive Section –

1. The Domain of Dialectical Reason

Must we then deny the existence of dialectical connections in a totality? By no means. Indeed, in the present state of our knowledge, I do not see that we are

in a position to affirm or deny it. Finally the elements of self-criticism in Althusser reverts to Sartre as the substance process of material developments in their empirical multitude which then is subject and is the theory of Sirohi's own subject, in fact an empirical account of say even Accounts and Billing for the economic process which then is the Keynesian system overturned for the whole counterpoint to Stalinism and bureaucracy or even practical theses and their failure – just watch him nail every point in empirical facts, I call this fact, *faktum* and dialectical analysis in Sirohi, get a concrete point and shoot in language in a practical fashion that makes you a high philosopher. This then is the key to practico-materialism in historico-critical investigation becoming Subject, that he can take himself as a subject of death and reveal its between two points or place between two deaths and even the be a subject – the intervalence of a subject in a rail station with Althusser. That aleatory fashions become the voice as in Mladen Dolar, that all transparent subjects in drive, deconstruction, writing, difference, even subject in Badiou all of this is the space of a discourse theory in Foucault, all of this is called in one light sentence by Sirohi, the Zionist, the simple aleatory logic of a train taken. Imagine Sirohi as follower of Cornel West, that he simply loves talking to him, I call this a subject, I would argue, like his love for Fidel or Malcolm X, that in fact fidelity is the key meaning of the Subject, the Paulinian work of love among us.

The procedure of discovering dialectical rationality in praxis, and then projecting it, as an unconditional law, on to the inorganic world, and then returning to the study of societies and claiming that this opaquely irrational law of nature conditions them, seems to us to be not in fact a complete aberration if stated that institutions, factories and all that industrial pollution is counter-finality to the process under human occupation and control, in fact a dialectic of organising production and its temporality and ekstases and nothing more. So working classes become historical and real and that is the real stuff that matters, not anything other than the heat of the situation – the realism of the progress becomes regressive. Science then is a virtue, even a habit meant to be poetic like a man on a black board, an antiquarian interest of just establishing constants while society becomes the real of a class action. A human relation, which can be recognised only because we are ourselves human, is encountered, hypostasised, stripped of every human characteristic and, finally, this irrational fabrication is substituted for the genuine relation which was encountered in the first place. Thus in the name of monism the practical rationality of man making History is replaced by the ancient notion of a blind Necessity, the clear by the obscure, the evident by the conjectural, Truth by Science Fiction. If there is a dialectic now, and if we are to establish it, we shall have to seek it where it is. We shall accept the idea that man is a material being among other material beings and, as such, does not have a privileged statute; we shall even refuse to reject a priori the possibility that when man leaves his domain of alienated existence and participates in the heat of a factory occupation, even his mental fancy does not matter unless a praxis, a real mind and a real engagement with the praxis-anti-praxis being the determination of freedom if implemented with happiness that the whole process is resolved when lived at home, the alienated existence jokes on the

real of leadership crises being external to the real process of class action and mass action which churns out the thesis as real.

Owing and fixing this connection. But at the same time, the provisional character of dialectical hyper-empiricism forces us to the conclusion that dialectical universality must be imposed a priori as a necessity. The 'a priori,' here, has nothing to do with any sort of constitutive principles which are prior to experience. It relates to a universality and necessity which are contained in every experience but which transcend any particular experience. But since, as Kant showed, experience provides facts but not necessity, and since we reject all idealist solutions, there is obviously a contradiction here. Husserl could speak of apodictic certainty without much difficulty, but this was because he remained on the level of pure, formal. 3) « Men make their own History ... but under circumstances ... given and transmitted from the past.'¹⁷ If this statement is true, then both determinism and analytical reason must be categorically rejected as the method and law of human history. Dialectical rationality, the whole of which is contained in this sentence, must be seen as the permanent and dialectical unity of freedom and necessity. I call this contingency and sex in Sirohi's life, that women will just fall in love in a unity of freedom and necessity a cliffhanger of a decision, that he does not care for women, unless they betray their real drive to find subject of fantasy barred a and then of course, the true loszenge a subject qua fantasy also as real voice, which means - je sa miem ve sa mien, the simple discourse of Platonist love that he is transcendental x to.